UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,546	07/28/2003	Bo Thiesson	MS305277.1/MSFTP485US	6935

23623 7590 01/23/2008

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
1900 EAST 9TH STREET, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
24TH FLOOR,
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
BERMAN, MELISSA J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2129	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/23/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,546	THIESSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Melissa J. Berman	2129	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 October 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11-16 and 19-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *10,17,18 and 24* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11-16 and 19-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 March 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an AMENDMENT entered 10/19/2007 for the patent application 10/628546 filed on 7/28/2003. The First Office Action of 7/19/2007 is fully incorporated into this Final Office Action by reference.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-15, 21 and 23 have been amended by the applicant. Claims 10, 17-18, and 24 have been cancelled by the applicant. Claims 1-9, 11-16, and 19-23 are examined in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-9, 11-16, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In determining whether the claim is for a "practical application," the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible, and concrete, but rather that the final result achieved by the claimed invention is useful, tangible and concrete. If the claim is directed to a practical application of the §101 judicial exceptions producing a result tied to the physical world that does not preempt the judicial exception, then the claim meets the statutory requirement of 35 U.S.C. §101.

The claims are a manipulation of abstract concepts and are not clear in purpose or scope.

The invention must be for a practical application and either:

1) specify transforming (physical thing - article) or

2) have the Final Result (not the steps) achieve or produce a

useful (specific, substantial, AND credible),

concrete (substantially repeatable/non-unpredictable), AND

tangible (real world/non-abstract) result

(tangibility is the opposite of abstractness).

In the present case, claims 1-9, 11-16, and 19-23 **preempt** a wide variety of decision tree learning. Decision tree learning is a commonly used method in data mining. Data mining is the process of identifying commercially useful patterns or relationships in databases or other computer repositories. Decision tree learning is not a practical application, but rather a mathematical technique which can be employed for practical application, such as implementing decision tree learning in data mining for understanding a consumer grocery purchases, decision tree learning in data mining for monitoring the efficiency of a website's navigation, decision tree learning in data mining for pattern recognition in images, or diagnosis of medical illnesses, etc.

The courts have also held that a claim may not preempt ideas, laws of nature or natural phenomena. The concern over preemption was expressed as early as 1852. See Le Roy v. Tatham, 55 U.S. (14 How.) 156, 175 (1852) ("A principle, in the abstract, is a fundamental truth; an original cause; a motive; these cannot be patented, as no one can claim in either of them an exclusive right."); Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co., 333 U.S. 127, 132, 76 USPQ 280, 282 (1948).

Accordingly, one may not patent every "substantial practical application" of an idea, law of nature or natural phenomena because such a patent "in practical effect would be a patent on the [idea, law of nature or natural phenomena] itself." "Here the "process" claim is so abstract and sweeping as to cover both known and unknown uses of the BCD to pure-binary conversion. The end use may (1) vary from the operation of a train to verification of drivers' licenses to researching the law books for precedents and (2) be performed through any existing machinery or future-devised machinery or without any apparatus." Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 71-72, 175 USPQ 673, 676 (1972).

The Courts have found that subject matter that is not a practical application or use of an idea, a law of nature or a natural phenomenon is not patentable. As the Supreme Court has made clear, " [a]n idea of itself is not patentable," *Rubber-Tip Pencil Co. v. Howard*, 20 U.S. (1 Wall.) 498, 507 (1874); taking several abstract ideas and manipulating them together adds nothing to the basic equation. In re Warmerdam, 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Displaying the score of a split in a decision tree or storing score on a computer-readable storage medium does not overcome preemption. The specification states that decision tree learning can be utilized for various data mining application, for example (see P 3, L 16-28, especially L 18-23). Decision tree learning is a technique specifically used in data mining and machine learning. Therefore, applying data mining as a practical application of decision tree learning would effectively be patenting every substantial practical application of the decision tree leaning since it is used specifically in data mining.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2007 have been considered but are not fully persuasive. In Re page 10, Applicant argues that the scoring component can be employed by users or subsequent automated components and this clearly represents a practical application.

Examiner does not find Applicant's arguments for persuasive. Although claims have been amended to include an displayed output and storage medium, the claims preempt a wide variety of decision tree leaning. Decision tree learning is a mathematical technique used in data mining. A practical application of data mining would be effectively patenting every substantial practical application of decision tree leaning. This would be preempting decision tree learning. Therefore, the objection of the specification STANDS.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa J. Berman whose telephone number is 571-270-1393. The examiner can normally be reached on 9/4/5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Vincent can be reached on 571-272-3080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Melissa J Berman

MJB

DAVID VINCENT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER